



Law Offices of
KARLA SHIPPEY

MICHAEL SHIPPEY, PH.D.

April 11, 2006
Page 2 of 4 Page(s)

Section 1. Supplemental Arguments in regard to 35 U.S.C. §§ 103

The Examiner has posed obviousness rejections in the instant application based on the following three prior art documents, all U.S. issued patents (now expired):

Roesch, U.S. 3,067,789 entitled "Tire Mounting and Spinning Device"

Listebarger, U.S. 1,936,984 entitled "Tire Changing Stand"

Little, U.S. 1,704,440 entitled "Collapsible Holding Device"

And further such rejections based on the additional 2 patents (in light of Roesch '789, cited above):

Gambardello, U.S. 3,049,159 entitled "Wheel Support and Lock for Tire Demounting"

Smith, 2,233,371 entitled "Wheel Machine"

Applicant argues that this impressive array of prior art does not disclose the current invention, nor even render it obvious. Indeed, the past publications teach away from the current invention.

The current invention, as claimed substantially in claim 1, is a device that allows a user to mount a tire on said device without lifting the tire off of the ground. Every one of above devices incorporates a stand, in order to bring the tire to comfortable, counter-level working height, so that the tire can be more easily worked. Gambardello '159 is situated at a convenient height for demounting a tire, while Little '440 reveals a stand for working rubber and other precursors into a new tire composition.

Every single prior art citation cited by the Examiner presupposes that the tire or tire precursor can be mounted upon the stand of the invention described therein. Not one prior art document describes an apparatus that, like a kneeling bus, can stoop to receive a tire that is not easily lifted off of the ground. That is precisely the purpose and mode of operation of the current invention.

Modern truck tires, even for on-road trucks, can reach a weight of 250 pounds apiece. In order to mount a tire for even such a simple operation as filling with air, the tire and hub assembly must be



Law Offices of
KARLA SHIPPEY

MICHAEL SHIPPEY, PH.D.

April 11, 2006
Page 3 of 4 Page(s)

lifted to the top of the stand of a changing device, of the type described in one or more of the prior art references. This can be literally back-breaking work.

The device of the present invention avoids that heavy lifting. It is thus a major safety-enhancing device for mechanics.

The reason that the prior art teaches away from this invention is probably due to the age of the prior art publications. Most of the tires in the days back in 1962 and earlier (which incorporates all the cited prior art) were smaller than today's tires. It was much easier to lift a lightweight auto tire to put on a stand, than it would be today, with the outsize tires in use in today's trucking industry.

Yet another reason that the prior art teaches away from the current invention is that the purpose of mounting these heavy truck tires on a stand is to force air into the hub, to seat the tire properly. As modern tires are tubeless, they must seat on the hub properly in order to hold air pressure.

Tubeless tires did not come into general use in the U.S.A. until well after 1962. Thus, the prior art inventions would have been dealing with tube tires (or, in the earliest patents, perhaps solid rubber tires). They would not have anticipated the need for air blasting as practiced today on tubeless truck tires.

The present invention is simple to use, yet effective, and avoids the difficult and dangerous task of lifting heavyweight truck tires. This need is a relatively modern one that was not anticipated, nor rendered obvious, in the prior art.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejections previously made in light of the important safety advancements of the current invention.



Law Offices of
KARLA SHIPPEY

MICHAEL SHIPPEY, PH.D.

April 11, 2006
Page 4 of 4 Page(s)

Remarks

Every effort has been made to constructively amend each area of the claims and specification in accordance with all of the examiner's observations in the above-referenced Office Action, in the previously offered amendments. Further arguments in support of this application are offered in the above pages.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests a timely Allowance in this case.

Applicant has prepared a short video presentation (homemade, not a marketing advertisement) that may help to illustrate the current invention. This video will be delivered to the Examiner if the examiner wishes to supply an email address. The video is only about 2 minutes in length.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael A. Shippey

Michael A. Shippey, Ph.D. Registered Agent # 45,588

4848 Lakeview Avenue, Suite B
Yorba Linda, California 92886
Telephone (714) 693-9110